UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,018	02/19/2002	Thomas T. Hanis	RSW920010192US1	5212

7590   06/27/2005

A. Bruce Clay
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC   27709

EXAMINER
ROCHE, TRENTON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/079,018	HANIS, THOMAS T.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Trenton J. Roche	2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _19 February 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-13_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed..

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-10 and 13_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _4,5,11 and 12_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _19 February 2002_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _02192002_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office action is responsive to communications filed 19 February 2002.

2.   Claims 1-13 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4.   Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

"Packaging WebLogic Server J2EE Applications" by Bea Systems, Inc., hereafter BEA.

As to claim 1, BEA discloses:

-      querying a subject servlet for associated servlet configuration data through the servlet

       development environment ("These utilities examine the objects you have assembled in a

       staging directory and build the appropriate deployment descriptors based on the servlet

       classes..." on page 3, section titled "Automatically Generating Deployment

       Descriptors.")

-      incorporating said servlet configuration data in a servlet configuration file ("These

       utilities examine the objects you have assembled in a staging directory and build the

       appropriate deployment descriptors based on the servlet classes..." on page 3, section

       titled "Automatically Generating Deployment Descriptors.")

- whereby said servlet configuration file can be processed in an application server to explicitly configure said subject servlet ("An application that is ready to deploy on WebLogic Server contains additional, WebLogic-specific deployment descriptors..." on page 1, section titled "Packaging Overview." Further, "Components and application have deployment descriptors – XML documents – that describe the contents..." on page 2, section titled "XML Deployment Descriptors.")

explicitly as claimed.

As to claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, BEA discloses selecting a servlet super class, identifying each servlet which extends from said selected super class, and performing said querying and incorporating steps for each said identified servlet as claimed ("These utilities examine the objects you have assembled in a staging directory and build the appropriate deployment descriptors based on the servlet classes..." on page 3, section titled "Automatically Generating Deployment Descriptors." The utility examines each class and object in the staging directory, otherwise the deployment descriptor would not accurately describe the servlet.)

As to claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, BEA discloses identifying at least one abstract class implemented by said servlet, and omitting said at least one abstract class during said performing step as claimed ("These utilities examine the objects you have assembled in a staging directory and build the appropriate deployment descriptors based on the servlet classes..." on page 3, section titled "Automatically Generating Deployment Descriptors." The utility examines each class and object in the staging directory, otherwise the deployment descriptor would not accurately describe the servlet.)

As to claims 6, 7, 8 and 13, the rejection regarding claim 1 is incorporated. Further, the limitations

disclosed in independent claims 6, 7, 8 and 13 are variations of those recited in independent claim 1,

and are rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 1. Further, with regards to claims

6 and 13, BEA discloses archiving said subject Web application and said Web Application descriptor

in a Web application archive file as claimed ("Web Applications are packaged as WAR files." on

page 12, section titled "Packaging J2EE Deployment Units") Finally, with regards to claim 7, BEA

also discloses an automated servlet configuration tool and a graphical user interface as claimed

("Java-based utilities that automatically generate the deployment descriptors…" on page 3, section

titled "Automatically Generating Deployment Descriptors.")

As to claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding

claim 2.

As to claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding

claim 3.

Allowable Subject Matter

5.   Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim

and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Trenton J. Roche whose telephone number is (571) 272-3733. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where

this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trenton J Roche
Examiner
Art Unit 2193

TJR

ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER